

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 31 2006

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 are now pending in the application. Claim 4 is now amended. The claim amendments are fully supported by the application as filed and do not introduce new subject matter. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, and 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Acker (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0058641). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants believe claim 1 is allowable over Acker because the claim and the prior art differ. The Office Action alleges that "requesting the satellite receiver module to send the channel information table to the radio display module if the version of the channel information table stored in the satellite receiver module is different from a version stored in the radio display module" of claim 1 is disclosed in page 4-5, sections [0057-0060] of Acker. However, Acker merely discloses a processor controlling a display in response to user inputs and real-time stored data in a continuously updated memory. Acker does not disclose or suggest that any conditions are required for the updating of the memory or that a request is made based on these conditions, as do the claims.

In other words, the memory of Acker does not make any requests in response to a comparison of versions of a channel information table. Instead, Acker merely seems to be automatically updating the memory information, as is common in the art, rather than as a function of a request based on a comparison of table versions. Nowhere does

Acker indicate that versions of tables are compared or that a request is made for an update based on this comparison. For at least the reason that the prior art does not include elements of claim 1, it is therefore believed to be allowable. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least this reason.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acker in view of Yuhara (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0192189). This rejection is respectfully traversed. As mentioned, claims 2 and 7 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least this reason.

Further, according to the Office Action, Acker teaches storing an indicator of a version of the channel information table that was sent to the radio display module. However, assuming FIG. 7 of Acker illustrates the a channel information table, as alleged, FIGs. 13A and 13B merely illustrate table information for channel 44 (channel 44 in FIG 7 includes: FRED, Red Hot Chili Pe, and Soul to Squeeze.) FIGs. 13A and 13B do not include different versions of a table, as alleged, instead, they include information *within* a table. Therefore, there can be no indication in Acker of which version of the table is stored because Acker is not describing multiple versions of a table. The Office Action does not allege that Yuhara discloses or suggests this limitation. Therefore, because claim 7 includes elements not disclosed or suggested by the prior art, either alone or in combination, it is believed to be allowable.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acker in view of Richard (U.S. Pat. No. 6,785,551). This rejection is respectfully

traversed. Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and is believed to be allowable for at least this reason and the reasons set forth below.

It is a longstanding rule that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1974), see MPEP §2143.03. The Office Action recognizes that Acker fails to teach re-constructing a channel information table in a radio display module but alleges that Richard includes this feature. Richard, however, merely teaches that information is reconstructed and then "passed" to a presentation module, which is allegedly equivalent to a radio display module. In contrast, claim 6 requires re-constructing the channel information table *in* a radio display module. Therefore, because the claims include a limitation not taught or suggested by the prior art, claim 6 is believed to be allowable for this additional reason.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**AUG 31 2006**

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the

Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248)-944-6519.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/30/06

By: 

Ralph Edwin Smith  
Reg. No. 35,474

Attorney for Applicants

CIMS 483-02-19  
DaimlerChrysler Intellectual Capital Company LLC.  
DaimlerChrysler Tech. Center  
800 Chrysler Drive  
Auburn Hills, Michigan 48326-2757  
Phone: 248-944-6519